



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,103	01/30/2004	Daniel M. Bodorin	MSFT122222	9005
27195	7590	03/13/2008	EXAMINER	
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			HAILU, TESHOME	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2139	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com  
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com  
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/769,103	BODORIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	TESHOME HAILU	2139	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kristine Kincaid. (3) Frank J. Schumacher IV, Reg. No. 61,292.  
 (2) Teshome Hailu. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 February 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lucas et al. US 6,968,461.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed about the restriction and rejection made by the examiner. Applicant indicated that Lucas fails to teach about "intercepting incoming data such the information does not reach a computer". Examiner agrees to further consider the discussed limitation. Regarding about the restriction, examiner is going to maintain the restriction made on the first office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kristine Kincaid/  
 SPE AU 2139

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required